

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,118 06/26/2003		06/26/2003	Ray D. Heineman	47320.0128	1117
20874	7590	09/11/2006		EXAMINER	
		& BILINSKI	CHEN, TIANJIE		
101 SOUTH SALINA STREET SUITE 400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SYRACUSI	E, NY 1	13202		2627	
•				DATE MAILED: 09/11/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **Advisory Action**

F. 8

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/604,118	HEINEMAN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Tianjie Chen	2627		

	Potoro the Eiling of an Annual Priof								
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief		Examiner	Art Unit						
<b>\</b>	_	Tianjie Chen	2627						
,	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THÈ	REPLY FILED 29 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.						
1. 🗵	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
b)	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
have under set for may in NOT	nsions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex r 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sorth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) ICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da ).	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi te of the final rejection, of	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed,					
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed NDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th						
3. [		but prior to the date of filing a brief.	, will not be entered b	ecause					
	(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	ow);							
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or								
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.						
4 [	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		maliant Amandmant	(DTOL 224)					
	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		impliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the					
7. 🛭	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of					
	Claim(s) objected to: <u>7-11</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 56-58</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>2-6,12-55</u> .								
AFFI	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good anwas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to can showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).					
	☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio UEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.					
	☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Attached Sheet.</u>		n condition for allowa	nce because:					
	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
13. L	Other:			7					
			Chen	Liente					
			TIANJIE C PRIMARY EX	Jiene 7 10 HEN AMINER					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/604,118

Art Unit: 2627

₩. Y

## **Attached Sheet**

• Applicant argues: "As shown in Hidano's FIG. 2, the magazines 30 are part of a mobile shelving rack for tapes to be exchanged for use with the storage system one at a time at the expense of speed and density. There is no suggestion in Hidano to eliminate the cartridge racks 2a in exchange for magazine racks to increase density. On the other hand, Dimilri is directed to increasing the speed of operation of a storage system while reducing the downtime associated with the failure of "a picker and/or transport assembly." In this regard, Dimitri teaches having magazine storage bins disposed in the middle of the library with "front open sides" and "back open sides," to allow for quicker access to stored media at the deliberate expense of density and capacity."

• Examiner sees no relationship between "to eliminate the cartridge racks 2a" and "to increase density;" and also no relationship between "to allow for quicker access to stored media" and "expense of density and capacity." These are all representative's baseless assumption.

And "speed up processing" is an explicit teaching from Dimitri and it is commonly acceptable suggestion for improving performance of a data processing device.

• Rejection maintains.